

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed September 25, 2007 (Paper No. 20070917). Upon entry of this response, claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-20 are pending in the application. In this response, claims 1, 8-10, and 19 have been amended, and claims 7 and 16 have been cancelled. Applicants respectfully request that the amendments being filed herewith be entered and request that there be reconsideration of all pending claims.

1. Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Smith spent with Applicants' Attorney, Karen G. Hazzah, during a telephone discussion about the outstanding Office Action on October 31, 2007 . The parties discussed the rejection of dependent claims 3, 7, 12, and 16 under the *Parker* reference. Applicants respectfully pointed out that *Parker* does not disclose a "notice of invitation" as recited in claims 3 and 12, or a "configuration change" as recited in claims 7 and 16. The Examiner indicated that a further review of the cited references is needed to confirm Applicants' assertion, and suggested that Applicants submit a response making these arguments.

2. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-20 have been rejected under §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by *Parker* (U.S. 2005/0131748). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, to the extent not rendered moot by claim cancellation. A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See, e.g., *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

a. Claims 1, 10, and 19

Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, and 19 to incorporate features from dependent claims 7 and 16. Applicants respectfully submit that *Parker* fails to teach, disclose or suggest at least the feature of “at least one softswitch that...receives at least one configuration change affecting handling of service requests in a more efficient manner” as recited in claim 1.

Applicants also respectfully submit that *Parker* fails to teach, disclose or suggest at least the feature of “receiving information at the at least one softswitch from the at least one force management system, the received information comprising at least one configuration change of the at least one softswitch to more efficiently handle service requests” as recited in claim 10.

Finally, Applicants also respectfully submit that *Parker* fails to teach, disclose or suggest at least the feature of “receiving information at the at least one force management system from the at least one softswitch, wherein the received information is at least one configuration change of the at least one softswitch to more efficiently handle service requests”.

Although the Office Action rejects claims 7 and 16, the Office Action does not specifically point to a component of *Parker* which allegedly corresponds to a “configuration change of the at least one softswitch”. Applicants have reviewed *Parker*, and do not find this feature disclosed in *Parker*. If the rejection is maintained in the next Office Action, the Examiner is requested to point out with particularity which component of *Parker* allegedly corresponds to this feature. For at least the reason that *Parker* fails to disclose, teach or suggest this feature, Applicants respectfully submit that *Parker* does not anticipate claims 1, 10, and 19, and request that the rejection of claims 1, 10, and 19 be withdrawn.

b. Claims 3 and 12

Applicants respectfully submit that *Parker* fails to teach, disclose or suggest at least the feature of “wherein the remote location is provided with notice of an invitation to work as a service center agent” as recited in claims 3 and 12. Although the Office Action rejects claim 3

and 12, the Office Action does not specifically point to a component of *Parker* which allegedly corresponds to a “notice of an invitation to work as a service center agent”. Applicants have reviewed *Parker*, and do not find this feature disclosed in *Parker*. If the rejection is maintained in the next Office Action, the Examiner is requested to point out with particularity which component of *Parker* allegedly corresponds to this feature. For at least the reason that *Parker* fails to disclose, teach or suggest this feature, Applicants respectfully submit that *Parker* does not anticipate claims 3 and 12., and request that the rejection of claims 3 and 12 be withdrawn.

Independent claims claims 1, 10, and 19 are allowable for at least the reasons argued above. Therefore, claims 3 and 12 are allowable for the separate and additional reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3 and 12 be withdrawn.

c. Claims 7 and 16

Claims 7 and 16 are cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and the rejection of these claims is therefore rendered moot. Applicants take this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these cancelled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate any of the cancelled subject matter to the public. Applicants expressly reserve the right to present cancelled claims 7 and 16, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequent to the present application.

d. Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-12, 14-15, 17-18, and 20

Since independent claims 1, 10, and 19 are allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-12, 14-15, 17-18, and 20 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598

(Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-12, 14-15, 17-18, and 20 be withdrawn.

3. Rejection of Claims 4 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4 and 13 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Parker* (2005/0131748) in view of *Forbes* (6,966,076). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. It is well established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious based upon a combination of references, the cited combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly, all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *In re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981). The addition of *Forbes* does not cure the deficiencies of *Parker* discussed above in connection with independent claims 1 and 10. Therefore, since independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable, claims 4 and 13 are considered patentable over the combination of these references, for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4 and 13 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and presently pending claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-20 be allowed to issue. Any statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known since the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicants' response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Karen G. Hazzah/

Karen G. Hazzah,
Reg. No. 48,472

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

600 Galleria Parkway, NW
Suite 1500
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Tel: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-0933